| Evaluation title | Cambodia: An Evaluation of WFP's Portfolio (2011-2017) | Evaluation Report # | OEV/2017/001 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Type | Country Portfolio | Centralised/ Decentralised | Centralised |
| Global / Region or Country | Cambodia | PHQA date | 27-07-2018 |

| Quality Rating - overall category | EPI – Overall Report Category |
|---|---|
| Meets requirements: 60% - 74% | 4-7   points =  Approaches requirements |

This evaluation shows an even quality at high levels across all quality criteria, with the section on evaluation context, purpose, objectives and scope exceeding requirements. Two main areas of improvement emerge: the systematic use of interview results in the report to strengthen the evidence base, particularly by using quantitative data or by quantifying qualitative interview results. This would also strengthen the added value of investments in the large number of interviews, considering time and money. A "quick win "would be an expanded table of contents to properly navigate the evaluation report. The richness of the report in terms of detailed sub-headings is currently unexploited but could easily be uncovered.

| CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY | Category | Meets |
|---|---|---|

The summary contains most of the required minimum information such as evaluation type, purpose, objectives, timeframe and scope. The tables and figures in the summary provide a clear description of the evaluation subject. This includes actual vs. planned beneficiaries, a breakdown of beneficiaries by sex, the geographic coverage, type of operation and implementation period. Given its comprehensiveness, the good use of graphics and tables, the summary could be used without the main report. The use of close to 6000 words contributes to the comprehensiveness. The potential area of improvement is the summary rather lengthy and reaches 5985 words, excluding words contained in graphics. However, it is a good summary of a complex evaluation. Some information contained in the report is not repeated in the summary, for example the evaluation users.

| CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT | Category | Meets |
|---|---|---|

The overview of the evaluation object is strong. The adaptation of the CP is well presented, from WFP's role in direct implementation of food assistance programmes to capacity development of national partners and local stakeholders to establish and manage programmes autonomously. The portfolio and transfer modalities are well captured. The accuracy of information sources are very high, with a large number of footnotes. The overview section could have benefitted from reconstructing the intervention logic of the CP.

| CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE | Category | Exceeds |
|---|---|---|

The evaluation context, purpose, objectives and scope are very strong. The only shortcoming in this strong section relates to gender. The economic context and gender-based violence are among the foci of the section on gender with food security and nutritional issues, however they are mentioned to a lesser extent.

| CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY | Category | Exceeds |
|---|---|---|

Overall, the methodology section is strong due to detailed and well-presented annexes on the methodology. The evaluation matrix serves as a solid basis for the CPE methodology. Limitations are transparently discussed and mitigation measures explained. The detailed sampling approach deserves mentioning. The evaluation team used a two-stage purposive sampling strategy for primary data collection at field sites, using a set of criteria. This serves as a good practice example for other complex evaluations in WFP. Despite the strength of this section, minimum information is often missing from the methodology section, even with this information detailed in the annexes, the correct references to signposting this information is often omitted. For example, ethical standards. In addition, the main evaluation questions are not delineated by evaluation criteria.

| CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS | Category | Meets |
| --- | --- | --- |

Findings are clearly aligned to the evaluation questions with good use of secondary data. WFP's contributions to results are well captured in the CPE including the internal and external factors affecting the CP result.  The CPE provides good analyses of the factors for strategic decision making. Even with the evaluation being very strong in presenting and analysing secondary data, bias in the presentation of primary data could have been even better addressed by quantifying interview results. Unintended results were to be captured in the evaluation but appear not to be fully addressed. In addition, previous evaluations are listed, such as the mid-term evaluation of the CP, but it remains unclear to what extent previous evaluation recommendations have been addressed.

| CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS | Category | Meets |
| --- | --- | --- |

Conclusions are drawn based on the evaluation criteria; a strategic overview is provided and the conclusions are balanced with both positive and negative findings being well reflected. The logical flow from findings to conclusions is hampered by the lack of key findings by evaluation criteria. The conclusions section suffers from this shortcoming. The evaluation could have drawn lessons of relevance for other CPs and it is a missed opportunity that those lessons were not captured in the report.

| CRITERION 7: GENDER | Category | Meets |
| --- | --- | --- |

Data collection methods included GEEW considerations. The methodology section lists the tools used for gender-appropriate data collection. Field data collection protocols for example included on-site measures to proactively engage with women. The evaluation team conducted gender-disaggregated data collection with same-gender facilitation, where possible. Findings, conclusions and recommendations include a gender analysis. Some GEEW related aspects could have been improved. For example, it is unclear to what extent the CP has been guided by system-wide objectives on GEEW; the report does not explain to what extent attention was paid to data referring to GEEW issues as part of the data screening and analysis process; and, the recommendations do not reflect an equity dimension.

| CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS | Category | Meets |
| --- | --- | --- |

Table 4 constitutes good practice in showing how the ET derived the recommendations. Each recommendation contains actionable bullet points. This is helpful as it facilitates how to implement the more generic "headline" recommendations. All recommendations are targeted, prioritized and time-bound. The feasibility of recommendations is unclear in one case.  It is unclear how feasible it is to change the capacities of staff to fulfil WFP's new institutional role in technical rather than operational support through workforce planning in 2018/2019, which is a short time period for such a major shift in skills.

| CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY | Category | Meets |
| --- | --- | --- |

The list of tables, graphics and other visual aids is provided. This supports the accessibility of the report. The report also benefits from systematic provision of information sources through over 350 footnotes. This level of detail constitutes good practice and seems to exceed requirements. The logical structuring of the report is suboptimal. While the findings section is organised along the lines of evaluation question, conclusions relate back to the evaluation criteria. Recommendations are organised by operational recommendations for 2018 and recommendations for the next CP.  The change in logic in those three main sections of the report

and it is difficult to follow and affects the logical flow of the report. The table of contents is kept very short, without the rich details of the headings and sub-headings contained in the report. This negatively affects the ease of navigating through the report and seems a missed opportunity to present the richness of the report's content. Page numbers are not accurate.

| Criteria Scoring Scale Legend - Gender Integration EPI | |
|---|---|
| 3 points = Fully integrated | |
| 2 points = Satisfactorily integrated | |
| 1 point = Partially integrated | |
| 0 point = Not at all integrated | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Scope & Indicators | 2 |
| 2. Criteria & Questions | 1 |
| 3. Methodology | 1 |
| 4. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations | 2 |
| Overall EPI SCORE | 6 |

| Quality Rating Scale Legend Evaluation Reports | | Overall Scoring of Gender EPI Scale Legend Evaluation Reports |
|---|---|---|
| | | UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator |
| Exceeds requirements: | 75% - 100% | |
| Meets requirements: | 60% - 74% | 11-12 points = Exceeds Requirements |
| Approaches requirements: | 50% - 59% | 8-10 points = Meets requirements |
| Partially meets requirements: | 25% - 49% | 4-7 points = Approaches requirements |
| Does not meet requirements: | 0% - 24% | 0-3 points = Missing requirements |